

In The Court Of Appeal Of The State Of California 118
Sixth Appellate District
San Jose, California

MONDAY, JUNE 26, 2000

H019954 PEOPLE v ALEJANDRO M.

The judgment is affirmed. (not published)
(Premo, Acting P.J.; We concur: Bamattre-Manoukian, J.,
Wunderlich, J.)
Filed June 26, 2000

TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 2000

H019122 PEOPLE v. VEGA, et al.

The judgment against Vega is modified to strike the
convictions for counts 10 and 12. As so modified, the
judgment is affirmed. The judgment against Mendes is modified
to strike the convictions for counts 9, 11, and 13. As so
modified, the judgment is affirmed. (not published)
(Premo, Acting P.J.; We concur: Bamattre-Manoukian, J.,
Wunderlich, J.)
Filed June 27, 2000

H020444 In re PRECIOUS M.; DFCS v. MARTIN M.

The judgment is affirmed. (not published)
(Premo, Acting P.J.; We concur: Bamattre-Manoukian, J.,
Wunderlich, J.)
Filed June 27, 2000

H016871 PEOPLE v. SENGPADYCHITH

(Filed order modifying opinion.) Appellant's petition
for rehearing is denied. This modification does not affect
the judgment. (not published)
(Bamattre-Manoukian, Acting P.J.; We concur: Wunderlich, J.,
Mihara, J.)
Filed June 27, 2000

Sixth Appellate District

San Jose, California

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 2000

H019471 PEOPLE v MONTIEL

The judgment is vacated and this matter is remanded to the trial court for the sole purpose of permitting the trial court to exercise its discretion to select the amount of the mandatory restitution fine. If the trial court exercises its discretion and selects the originally imposed \$10,000 restitution fine, it shall reinstate the original judgment. If the court selects a different amount for this fine, it shall impose a new judgment which includes the new amount of the fine. (not published)

(Mihara, J.; We concur: Cottle, P.J., Elia, J.)

Filed June 28, 2000

H018333 LUDGATE v LOCKHEED

The order granting Ludgate's motion for judgment on the pleadings is reversed. The order denying Lockheed's bond motion is affirmed. The matter is remanded to the trial court for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. Because the main issue in this appeal is the judgment on the pleadings issue, we declare Lockheed the prevailing party in this appeal, even though it failed in the collateral bond motion issue. Lockheed is awarded the costs of this appeal. (not published)

(Elia, Acting P.J.; We concur: Bamattre-Manoukian, J., Wunderlich, J.)

Filed June 28, 2000

H020406 PEOPLE v. CARLOS O.

By the Court*:

Appellant's petition for rehearing is denied.

Dated: June 28, 2000

*Before Premo, Acting P.J., and Wunderlich, J.

H020164 PEOPLE v. MENDOZA

The judgment is affirmed. (not published)

(Elia, J.; We concur: Cottle, P.J., Mihara, J.)

Filed June 28, 2000

In The Court Of Appeal Of The State Of California 120
Sixth Appellate District
San Jose, California

Wednesday, June 28, 2000 (Continued)

H019595 PEOPLE v. MARISCAL
BY THE COURT:

Upon the court's own motion, the submission order in the above-entitled matter dated April 11, 2000, is hereby vacated. The court by separate letter dated June 23, 2000, has requested supplemental briefing from the parties. The cause will be resubmitted upon completion of supplemental briefing.
Dated: June 28, 2000 PREMO, ACTING P.J.

H020681 PEOPLE v. ALLEN
The judgment is affirmed. (not published)
(Elia, J.; We concur: Cottle, P.J., Mihara, J.)
Filed June 28, 2000

THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 2000

H019358 PEOPLE v. RAMIREZ-MARTINEZ
The judgment is affirmed. (not published)
(Mihara, J.; We concur: Cottle, P.J., Elia, J.)
Filed June 29, 2000

H017531 BEHR v. PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO.
The amended judgment, filed June 3, 1998, is affirmed in the following particulars. As to plaintiff Cynthia Behr, judgment in the amount of \$7.5 million on the non-economic damages portion of her cause of action for misrepresentation is affirmed and the trial court's order granting a new trial on the economic damages portion of this cause of action is affirmed. As to plaintiff Cole Behr, judgment in the amount of \$6 million on his cause of action for negligence is affirmed.

The cause is remanded so that the court may determine the amount the judgment is to be reduced by virtue of sums paid to plaintiffs by the settling parties.

The parties are to bear their own costs on appeal. (not published)
(Bamattre-Manoukian, Acting P.J.; We concur: Wunderlich, J., Mihara, J.)
Filed June 29, 2000

Sixth Appellate District

San Jose, California

FRIDAY, JUNE 30, 2000

H018285 PEOPLE v. VERDIN

H018818 PEOPLE v. VERDIN

H020004 In re VERDIN on Habeas Corpus

The judgments are affirmed. The petition for writ of
habeas corpus is denied. (not published)

(Mihara, J.; We concur: Cottle, P.J., Elia, J.)

Filed June 30, 2000